

COT MEETING MINUTES

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Friday, February 10, 2012

10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

CONFERENCE ROOM 119A/B

MEMBERS PRESENT

Michael Baumstark
Bennett Evan Cooper
Randolph Bartlett
Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Michael Jeanes (*Rich McHattie, proxy*)
Dennis Kavanaugh*
Gary Krcmarik
Sheri Newman
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
John Rezzo
Delcy Scull*
Roxanne Song Ong
Garye Vasquez*
Lawrence Winthrop (*Diane Johnsen, proxy*)

GUESTS

W. Scott Bales, *Supreme Court*
Steve Ballance, *TAC*
Janet Cornell, *Scottsdale City Court*
Rona Newton, *PACC/CACC*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Kent Batty
Rebecca Lund

AOC STAFF

Richard Blair, *ITD*
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Dave Byers, *Exec Office*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Melissa Hinojosa, *ITD*
Terri McHaney, *Finance*
Jim Scorza, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*

COT MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Hon. Andrew Hurwitz,
Chair

Vice Chief Justice Andrew Hurwitz, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. He welcomed members and introduced Judge Randy Bartlett from Mohave County Superior Court who has taken Judge Gould's place, following his recent appointment to Court of Appeals, Division One. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed.

Justice Hurwitz updated members on several items including:

- Updates to the technical standards related to electronic documents and e-filing reviewed in previous meetings have been approved and are now in effect.
- The Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC's) intends to solicit for a vendor to provide remote access to case-related documents. Staff member Stewart Bruner added that the work relates to two projects on COT's list of priorities.
- The schedule for steering committees to bring software enhancement requests to the COT annual meeting, to preclude a repeat of last year's collapsed timeline.
- The progress toward mandatory e-filing-at Division One and the Supreme Court for fee-paying filers April 2, following changes to the current PayPal payment system.

The chair then called members' attention to the minutes from the November 4, 2011, meeting.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 4, 2011, Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 12-01

BUSINESS DRIVERS FROM IT STRATEGIC PLAN INPUT

Mr. Stewart Bruner

Justice Hurwitz introduced Stewart Bruner who appeared in his capacity as Strategic Planning Manager for AOC's Information Technology Division. Stewart shared some macro-level court business trends collected by the National Center for State Courts then detailed prevalent themes collected from business input he's received from the strategic plans. Only half of the non-urban counties are being asked for plans again this year, along with Maricopa and Pima. Technical inputs are due March 16 for plans to be reviewed and summarized in time for approval at the annual meeting in early May.

STRATEGIC PROJECTS UPDATE

Hon. Michael Pollard
Mr. Karl Heckart

Judge Michael Pollard reviewed the list of priority projects approved at the May 2011 annual meeting and displayed a timeline of project durations updated since shown at the November meeting. He detailed progress made by the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) since the November meeting. After gathering more detailed data regarding resource conflicts and likely timelines for completing priority projects, CACC concluded that no clear conflict points exist, IT resources are difficult to keep in today's improving economy, and expected business functionality is highly dependent on case management system (CMS) releases in one way or another. CACC's proposed priority list reflects a CMS-centric approach:

1. Limited Jurisdiction (LJ) Mesa/Large Volume CMS

COT MEETING MINUTES

2. General Jurisdiction (GJ) Enhancements and Fixes
3. LJ AZTEC Replacement
4. JOLTSaz Integration
5. e-Filing in Rural Courts
6. APETS Integration

Mr. Karl Heckart, Chief Information Officer (CIO) for the AOC, offered his perspective on the data and related caveats received from local staff and vendors, then added that CACC's priority list addresses the risk that a vendor may not deliver needed functionality on the required timetable or may not be able to fit all the agreed functions into a single software release. Justice Hurwitz clarified that the listed items can continue to be worked on simultaneously until a direct conflict arises between any of them.

A suggestion was made to include the name of the vendor or locality on which each priority item depends for resources. Karl agreed that the addition made sense to include when the chart is next updated.

MOTION	A motion was made and seconded to accept CACC's CMS-based list of project priorities as presented. The motion passed unanimously.	TECH 12-02
---------------	--	-------------------

STRATEGIC PROJECTS AT MARICOPA SUPERIOR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE

Mr. Rich McHattie

Before introducing Mr. Rich McHattie, Deputy Director for Strategic Planning, Information Technology & Records Management at the Maricopa Clerk of the Superior Court's Office, the chair informed members that Mr. John Barrett was not available until May to present the remainder of his material deferred from the November meeting. Rich then displayed the three categories of technology in the Clerk's Office and the various products that lie within each category. He displayed an extensive list of internal projects before describing the governance process that assigns each a priority based on a weighted formula involving five factors. Of the eight projects identified as significant at the moment, Rich focused on Foundation, the effort to re-architect the automation behind e-filing to enable sufficient flexibility to respond to future increases in volume and enhancement requests. Rich illustrated Judge Pollard's earlier point by describing how the Foundation project timeline has become uncertain as a result of reliance on ever-changing contract resources.

In answer to a member's question, Karl explained that tackling the case types having the highest associated volume of e-filings is more important at present than expanding the total breadth of case types, due to the need for revenue to sustain the e-filing project as a whole.

DISASTER RECOVERY & BUSINESS CONTINUITY IN COURT

Mr. Stewart Bruner
Mr. Karl Heckart

Staff Member Stewart Bruner refreshed members' memories about a long-running project to ascertain risks to court automation, especially items on which the local courts rely on the AOC for service continuity or restoration. He outlined the process used to solicit input necessary to

COT MEETING MINUTES

quantify the expectations of courts and related costs of meeting those expectations. Stewart promised details at the annual meeting in May; the goal of today's discussion was only to provide a context for the details and any related costs that would be presented. In conclusion, he shared two options once impacts are quantified: 1) set aside funding necessary to meet the expected service restoration times or 2) inform courts of the length of restoration times that are affordable and ask them to improve workarounds and their non-IT contingency plans.

EXPECTATIONS FOR STORAGE OF SCANNED DOCUMENT

Mr. Jim Price

Jim Price, AZTurboCourt e-Filing Program Manager at the AOC, informed members of inconsistencies he has encountered in the way courts store electronic documents filed over the counter. The design of e-filing and public access systems are predicated on filed documents being stored individually, but some courts aggregate over-the-counter case filings into a single composite file for various reasons. No written policy exists about the practice. Jim described various implications for security, case party access, document driven automated workflow, file sizes, and public access when electronic documents associated with open cases continue to be stored in an aggregated fashion.

Members were not convinced the situation warranted policy action without first understanding the degree of aggregation being performed and the reasons courts do it. Karl responded that the root is a resource issue coupled with a lack of understanding of the larger paradigm for the electronic document lifecycle. He argued that the policy must be clarified to prevent downstream consequences because files that are disaggregated may later be aggregated but files that are aggregated initially cannot be disaggregated later without incurring additional costs. Courts are not taking into account that their paper safety net will be disappearing as mandatory e-filing spreads.

Following extensive discussion and impromptu testimony from Steve Ballance, the chair summarized that members were in agreement that disaggregation is the appropriate strategy for official records of the court (items in filings that yield individually docketed actions must be stored as individual electronic files). The sticking point involves the consequences of that decision on courts that currently aggregate electronic case records at some level. Mike Baumstark proposed that COT merely provide guidance concerning the need to disaggregate and ask staff to describe the business issues that lead to the continued practice of aggregating.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to develop a draft policy regarding the granularity of official electronic records after obtaining information from the impacted courts with regard to maintaining an aggregate or granular official electronic court record. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 12-03

Justice Hurwitz then invited any courts taking issue with the decision to share with COT their business reasons for aggregating electronic documents. Dave Byers recommended that staff draft a code section in time for the next meeting then solicit feedback as part of the formal review and approval process.

COT MEETING MINUTES

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL UPDATE

Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl returned in his role as Technical Advisory Council (TAC) chair to relay the outcome of discussions at TAC resulting in the latest proposed updates to the table of enterprise architecture standards. Karl described many changes as representing movement of packaged software tools over time from one lifecycle phase to the next as they fall out of support. He also highlighted the addition of mobile operating systems to the table with no target declared but the BlackBerry as a containment item and Android/Apple iOS as watchlist items for the moment.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the 2012 update to the Enterprise Architecture Standards table, as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 12-04

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Hon. Andrew Hurwitz

Justice Hurwitz predicted that the May 3 and 4 annual meeting will be held on only one of the two days reserved on the calendar. He raised the possibility of a change in date if the legislature fails to pass the FY13 budget in time.

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, the chair entertained a motion to adjourn at 12:25 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:

May 03 & 04, 2012	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B
September 14, 2012	AOC – Conference Room 106

MEETING ADJOURNED

12:25 PM